

REMARKS

Preliminary remark

Applicants note that the present reply comprises numerous amendments to the claims, as well as new claims, although the present reply is a response to a final Office Action. Applicants note that the final Office Action has been issued by a different Examiner than the present Examiner. Applicants respectfully request the present Examiner to study the proposed amended set of claims and arguments, so as to allow the Applicants and the Examiner to conduct a telephone interview to advise the Applicants of the allowability of the amended set of claims, should said amended set of claims be presented along with a Request for Continued Examination.

Alternatively, it is noted that this Office Action is repetitive of the previous Office Action in the 35 U.S.C. 102 rejection of original claim 17. This despite the fact that the Applicants responded to this rejection. Accordingly, it is submitted that this action was made final prematurely, before a clear issue could be developed between the examiner and the Applicants, as provided by MPEP 706.07, and Applicants therefore respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the finality of the present Office Action and to reconsider the arguments put forth in response to the previous Office Action regarding claim 17, which are repeated and developed hereafter.

Amendment to the claims

Claims 1-4, 6-7 and 9-22 are pending in the present application.

The language of claims 1 and 2 has been clarified, in particular referring to Fig. 6 of the application and the corresponding portion of the specification.

The language of claim 4 has been clarified, in particular referring to Fig. 19 of the application and the corresponding portion of the specification.

Claim 6 has been made dependent on claim 4. The language of claim 6 has been amended consistently with the language amendments of claim 4.

The language of claim 7 has been clarified, in particular referring to Fig. 19 of the application and the corresponding portion of the specification.

The language of claims 9 and 13 has been clarified consistently with the language amendments of claim 2.

The language of claims 10-12 and 14-16 has been clarified consistently with the language amendments of claim 4, and referring to Fig. 23 of the Application and the corresponding portion of the specification.

The language of claims 18 and 19 has been clarified, in particular referring to Figs. 10, 11 and 12 of the Application and the corresponding portion of the specification.

New independent claim 23 and new claims 24-25 have been added. New claims 23-25 taken together recite the features of claim 4 in a clarified language. New claims 23, 24 and 25 are supported by the application as filed, in particular paragraphs [143], [141] and [142] of the specification.

New dependent claim 26 has been added. New claim 26 recites the features of claim 6 in a clarified language, and is supported by the application as filed, in particular paragraph [153] of the specification.

New independent claim 27 and new dependent claims 28-29 have been added. New claims 27-29 taken together recite the features of claim 7 in a clarified language. New claims 27, 28 and 29 are supported by the application as filed, in particular paragraphs [149], [147] and [148] of the specification.

New independent claim 30 and new dependent claim 31 have been added. New claim 30 recites the features of claim 2 in a clarified language, and new claims 30 and 31 taken together recite the features of claim 1 in a clarified language. New claims 30-31 are supported by the application as filed, in particular Fig. 6 of the application and the corresponding portion of the specification.

No new matter has been added.

The claims have not been narrowed nor amended for patentability. The claims have simply been amended to clarify. If anything, the claims have been broadened by these amendments.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C 112

Claims 4, 6, 7, 10-12 and 14-16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention.

Applicants note that the language of claim 4 has been clarified. In particular, Applicants submit that claim 4 now clearly recites that the external packet is converted into an internal packet if the conversion table of the first access control apparatus comprises a "set of three addresses" comprising:

a source internal address assigned to a logic terminal of a communication line termination receiving said external packet,

the external destination address of said received external packet; and

the external source address of the received external packet.

The language of claims 6, 7, 10-12 and 14-16 has been clarified consistently with the language amendments of claim 4. Accordingly, Applicants submit that amended claims 4, 6, 7, 10-12 and 14-16 comply with 35 U.S.C. 112, and respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw this rejection.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C 102

Claims 17, 18 and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,793,763 to Mayes. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Claim 17

Applicants note that in response to the prior Office Action, mailed November 3, 2004, Applicant explained why Mayes does not anticipate claim 17, and in particular indicated at least one limitation of claim 17 that is not taught by Mayes. Applicants note that in the outstanding Action, the Examiner has merely restated the arguments of the prior Action but has failed to include a rebuttal of the arguments raised in the Applicant's reply to the previous action. Therefore, the Examiner has thus far failed to express the grounds of rejection in a manner that is clearly developed so as to be informative to the Applicants (see MPEP 706.7 and 707.07(d)). Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider the following arguments, and to withdraw the final rejection in this matter.

The Examiner asserts that Mayes discloses an IP network wherein "only when the destination address is [a] local address, the packet from the internet is regarded as [a] local packet". Applicants disagree and note that Mayes discloses an IP network provided for dropping unwanted external packets and for replacing external addresses by local addresses in the header of wanted external packets, wherein the (e.g. in FIG. 5) an inbound packet is either dropped (steps 208, 218, 228) or translated (steps 212, 220), and wherein no inbound external packet is therefore taken in the network without header modification, or "regarded as" an "internal packet", as recited in claim 17. Applicants therefore submit that Mayes cannot be deemed to disclose or suggest an IP network wherein for given external packets, "*the internal packet is transferred in said IP network by regarding the external packet as the internal packet*", as recited in claim 17, and submit that claim 17 is patentable over Mayes. Should the Examiner disagree, Applicants respectfully request him to clearly and specifically point out where Mayes discloses the above features, in accordance with 37 C.F.R. 1.104(c)(2).

Claims 18 and 19

Applicants submit that the Examiner has failed to show that Mayes discloses or suggests a system having a conversion table including plural records, "*wherein each record comprises at least one of a source transmitting permission field and a destination transmission field for indicating if transmitting of the internal packet associated with said record is permitted or not*" as recited in amended claim 18, or "*wherein each record comprises a source receiving permission field for indicating if receiving of the internal packet associated with said record is permitted or not*" as recited in amended claim 19.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that amended claims 18 and 19 are patentable over Mayes.

New claims

Applicants submit that new claims 23-31 are patentable over the cited prior art as claims 23-29 substantially recite the features of patentable claims 4, 6 and 7 and claims 30-31 substantially recite the features of patentable claims 1 and 2.

In view of the above, Applicants submit that the application is now in condition for allowance and respectfully urge the Examiner to pass this case to issue.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required or credit overpayment to deposit account no. 12-0415. In particular, if this response is not timely filed, the Commissioner is authorized to treat this response as including a petition to extend the time period pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) requesting an extension of time of the number of months necessary to make this response timely filed and the petition fee due in connection therewith may be charged to deposit account no. 12-0415.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Post Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on

July 5, 2005

(Date of Transmission)

Lonnie Louie

(Name of Person Transmitting)



(Signature)

7/5/05

(Date)

Respectfully submitted,



Mavis S. Gallenson

Attorney for Applicants

Reg. No. 32,464

LADAS & PARRY

5670 Wilshire Boulevard,
Suite 2100

Los Angeles, California 90036

(323) 934-2300 voice

(323) 934-0202 facsimile